PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298

FILED
12/02/25
12:19 PM
R2001007

December 2, 2025

Agenda ID #23901
Ratesettting

TO PARTIES OF RECORD IN RULEMAKING 20-01-007:

This is the proposed decision of Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) David Van Dyken and ALJ Robin Purchia. Until and unless the Commission hears the item and votes to approve it, the proposed decision has no legal effect. This item may be heard, at the earliest, at the Commission's January 15, 2026 Business Meeting. To confirm when the item will be heard, please see the Business Meeting agenda, which is posted on the Commission's website 10 days before each Business Meeting.

Parties to the proceeding may file comments on the proposed decision as provided in Rule 14.3 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. Electronic copies of comments should also be sent to the Intervenor Compensation Program at icompcoordinator@cpuc.ca.gov.

/s/ MICHELLE COOKE
Michelle Cooke
Chief Administrative Law Judge

MLC:avs
Attachment

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF ALJ VAN DYKEN and ALJ PURCHIA**
(Mailed 12/2/2025)

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Establish Policies, Processes, and Rules to Ensure Safe and Reliable Gas Systems in California and Perform Long-Term Gas System Planning.	Rulemaking 20-01-007

DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 23-12-003

Intervenor: Environmental Defense Fund	**For contribution to Decision (D.)** 23-12-003
Claimed: $64,408.30	**Awarded:** $31,152.50
Assigned Commissioner: Karen Douglas	**Assigned ALJs:** David Van Dyken and Robyn Purchia[1]

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	Decision on Phase 2 Issues Regarding Transmission Pipelines and Storage (D.23-12-003)

B. Intervenor must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812:[2]

	Intervenor	CPUC Verification
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	March 24, 2020	Verified
2. Other specified date for NOI:	N/A	
3. Date NOI filed:	April 9, 2020	Verified

[1] Administrative Law Judge Robyn Purchia was co-assigned to this proceeding on April 9, 2024.

[2] All statutory references are to California Public Utilities Code unless indicated otherwise.

	Intervenor	CPUC Verification
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes
Showing of eligible customer status (§ 1802(b)) or eligible local government entity status (§§ 1802(d), 1802.4):		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.12-06-013	R.20-01-007
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	February 25, 2013	May 29, 2020
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	N/A	
8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer status or eligible government entity status?		Yes
Showing of "significant financial hardship" (§1802(h) or §1803.1(b)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	D.21-11-017	D.21-11-017 authorized Pacific Gas and Electric Company to implement an optional day-ahead real time rate for commercial electric vehicle customers. A ruling issued in R.20-01-007 granted EDF a showing of significant financial hardship.
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	November 19, 2021	May 29, 2020
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	N/As	
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.23-12-003	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	December 21, 2023	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	February 20, 2024	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

C. Additional Comments on Part I:

#	Intervenor's Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
9 / 10	In D.20-09-007, the CPUC found that EDF had demonstrated customer status and significant financial hardship.	D.20-09-007, issued in A.18-11-003, does not provide a finding of eligible customer status and significant financial hardship in this proceeding. We remind EDF to include relevant customer status and significant financial hardship findings in their future requests for compensation.

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION

A. Did the Intervenor substantially contribute to the final decision (*see* § 1802(j), § 1803(a), 1803.1(a) and D.98-04-059):

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
EDF's Opening and Reply Comments on the Proposed Decision focused on the need to provide better clarity and information on the rate impacts of transmission pipeline derating; and a new determination of the "used and usefulness" of the resulting distribution pipeline. "Second, the Commission should require a comprehensive review of transmission pipeline derating, including an analysis of both the 'used-and-usefulness' of newly derated pipelines and potential non-pipeline alternatives through a Tier 2 Advice letter." (EDF Opening Comments on the Proposed Decision at 2) "To the extent the Proposed Decision is intended to capture a broader decision regarding repair, replacement, derating, or decommissioning, the Commission should replace the proposed two-step	The Commission noted EDF's arguments but did accept EDF's recommendations. However, EDF developed the record on this matter. "EDF recommends utilities be clear about which customers are on a transmission pipeline planned for derating or decommissioning. EDF comments that the utility should demonstrate that a distribution pipeline resulting from the deration of a transmission pipeline will be 'used and useful.'" (Decision at 18) "Third, while we agree with EDF's recommendation that the utility be clear about customers on a transmission pipeline for derating, we do not require any changes in existing utility practices regarding informing customers of planned derating at this time." (Decision at 22)	Verified

review process with a single comprehensive step examining the 'used-and-usefulness' […]" (EDF Reply Comments on the Proposed Decision at 3)	"Fourth, we do not adopt EDF's recommendation that we require the utilities to demonstrate that a distribution pipeline resulting from the deration of a transmission pipeline will be 'used and useful.'" (Decision at 22)	
EDF highlighted the possibility that derating of transmission pipelines can actually increase cost impacts to core customers. "The Proposed Decision finds, erroneously, that 'deration of transmission pipelines will reduce costs for all customers' […] EDF strongly objects to such a finding and urges the Commission to delete Findings of Fact 13 that includes such strong language; instead acknowledging upfront potential cost impacts to core customers of derating transmission pipelines." (EDF Opening Comments on the Proposed Decision at 3) "EDF's opening comments highlighted how this proposed process not only overlooks potential cost impacts to core customers but is inconsistent with both reasoning contained in the Proposed Decision itself and existing Commission guidance such as GO177." (EDF Reply Comments on the Proposed Decision at 3)	The Commission noted EDF's arguments and amended the Findings of Fact in the adopted Decision to reflect EDF's points. "EDF comments that derating transmission pipelines to distribution pipelines may increase costs for core customers because non-core customers' rates only include distribution costs if the customer uses the distribution pipeline infrastructure in question. EDF recommends deletion of Finding of Fact 13. Instead, the final decision modifies Finding of Fact 13 to reflect that derating a transmission line to a distribution line potentially reduces overall customer costs." (Decision at 40)	Verified
EDF recommended that transmission costs attributable to electric reliability should be reflected in dedicated electric generation rates. "EDF, however, also believes simply highlighting the importance of electric reliability is insufficient and may actually result in undue cost burden	The Commission did not adopt EDF's recommendation and noted that "cost allocation questions and potential rate adjustments stemming from transmission pipeline derating will be considered in a later phase of this proceeding." (Decision at 22)	Verified

for core customers. Electric reliability is indeed an important concern; and the best way to support it would be to make clear who relies on and who, as a result, pays for the necessary infrastructure." (EDF Reply Comments on the Proposed Decision at 4)	However, EDF developed the record on this matter.	
EDF recommended that the Proposed Decision's section on gas storage should be struck. "EDF urges the Commission to strike Section 7 of the Proposed Decision in its entirety." (EDF Reply Comments on the Proposed Decision at 5)	The Commission did not adopt EDF's recommendations. However, EDF developed the record on this matter. "This section [7] finds that natural gas storage facilities are necessary for reliability and cost management." (Decision at 34-35)	
As part of the current proceeding, EDF filed comments on the GO 177 Annual Reports workshop presentations from the utilities. EDF highlighted the lack of sufficient information and analysis provided by the utilities, contrary to the requirements of GO 177. EDF recommended that the Commission instruct the joint utilities to refile their reports to include information on project details, project justification, and non-pipeline alternative analyses. (EDF Comments of GO 177 Workshop at 4)	The Commission did not adopt EDF's recommendations. However, EDF participated in the GO 177 process as laid out in the Commission's decision and developed the record on this matter. "Parties to Rulemaking 20-01-007, or a successor proceeding, may serve or file comments on the annual Report of Planned Gas Investments recommending changes to the reports, or to the report requirements […]" (D.22-12-021 at 101)	Noted, however, participating in the GO 177 process and developing the record on this matter did not contribute to the decision-making process for D.23-12-003. See Part III.D CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments [7].
As part of the current proceeding, EDF filed comments on the GO 177 Annual Reports workshop presentations from the utilities. EDF noted that the exemptions from the GO 177 process claimed by the Sempra utilities were excessive, contrary to the requirements and intent of GO 177. EDF recommended the Commission to instruct the utilities to	The Commission did not adopt EDF's recommendations. However, EDF participated in the GO 177 process as laid out in the Commission's decision and developed the record on this matter. "Parties to Rulemaking 20-01-007, or a successor proceeding, may serve or file comments on the annual Report of Planned Gas Investments	Noted, however, participating in the GO 177 process and developing the record on this matter did not contribute to the decision-making process for

refile their reports to limit exemptions to necessary cases and to provide detailed justification for their claims. (EDF Comments of GO 177 Workshop at 4)	recommending changes to the reports, or to the report requirements […]" (D.22-12-021 at 101)	D.23-12-003. See Part III.D CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments [7].
As part of the current proceeding, EDF filed a motion requesting a technical workshop to ensure the reporting and implementation of GO 177 are done in a manner consistent with the Commission's intent behind GO 177. EDF filed an initial motion on April 11, 2023; and an additional reply on May 5, 2023. EDF further participated in discussions with the joint utilities on setting the agenda for the 2023 Annual Workshop, as directed by the ALJ. "EDF observes that the Commission, the gas utilities, and the other stakeholders would benefit from more robust reporting and consistent interpretation and implementation of GO 177. To that end, EDF requests that a technical workshop to address these matters [sic]." (EDF Motion at 3) "EDF maintains its request for specific relief: a technical workshop facilitated by the Commission to inform the Commission's next steps in this Rulemaking." (EDF Reply Comments at 5)	The Commission denied EDF's motion without prejudice. However, the Commission noted that the topics raised in EDF's motion were appropriate for inclusion in the 2023 Annual Workshop; and directed the utilities to include those topics. "The topics identified in the EDF motion for discussion are suitable to include in the 2023 Annual Workshop […] To provide discussion on these topics at the Annual Workshop, the Sempra companies and PG&E shall work with interested parties to plan the agenda for the workshop, shall include time for the three identified topics in the workshop agenda and shall include sufficient time in the agenda for the parties to provide verbal input and for broad party discussions." (ALJ Ruling Denying EDF Motion at 2)	Noted, however, participating in the GO 177 process and developing the record on this matter did not contribute to the decision-making process for D.23-12-003. See Part III.D CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments [7].
As part of the current proceeding, EDF filed comments on the staff gas infrastructure decommissioning proposal which was provided by the Commission Energy Division staff in response to questions laid out in the Scoping Memo. (EDF Comments on	The ALJ directed the parties to the current proceeding to respond to questions set out in the staff proposal; and if necessary, file additional comments on topics not covered in the staff proposal. (ALJ	Noted, however, these hours did not contribute to the decision-making process for

Staff Proposal filed February 24, 2023) EDF further conferred with various stakeholders to provide input on the staff proposal.	Ruling Directing Parties to File Comments at 2).	D.23-12-003. See Part III.D CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments [6].
On June 15, 2022, EDF filed opening comments on scoping questions 2.1(b)-2.1(k) which include various issues in scope for D.23-12-003. EDF further filed reply comments on these questions on June 27, 2022. EDF raised key issues that were further developed as part of the proceeding. "So EDF encourages the Commission to direct the gas utilities to be very clear about what customers will/will not be on the transmission line planned for de-rating or decommission." (Opening Comments of EDF on ALJ Ruling Seeking Comments at 6) "To the extent a transmission pipeline must be derated for safety or other reasons, the Commission will need to consider whether the line remains used and useful to customers, and if so, which customers. Simply derating a line from transmission to distribution may result in a cost shift, that is, a shift from a sharing of costs between core and non-core customers to one where cost recovery is solely from core (mostly residential) customers." (Opening Comments of EDF on ALJ Ruling Seeking Comments at 7)	The ALJ direct parties to file comments on Track 2a scoping questions 2.1(a) through 2.1(k) which include the issues discussed in D.23-12-003. The Decision further notes that this ruling and subsequent party comments were part of the procedural process for D.23-12-003. "Parties shall file comments on Track 2, Scoping Questions 2.1(b) through 2.1(k) set out in the Amended Scoping Memo dated January 5, 2022." (ALJ Ruling Seeking Comments at 1) "On May 5, 2022, the assigned ALJ issued a ruling seeking party comments on the Amended Scoping Memo, Track 2A Scoping Questions (b)-(k). Opening comments were filed on June 15, 2022. Reply comments were filed on June 27, 2022." (Decision at 5)	Verified

B. Duplication of Effort (§ 1801.3(f) and § 1802.5):

	Intervenor's Assertion	CPUC Discussion
a. Was the Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates) a party to the proceeding?	Yes	Verified
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	Yes	Verified
c. If so, provide name of other parties: Sierra Club/Rocky Mountain Institute (RMI)/California Environmental Justice Alliance (CEJA), Utility Consumers' Action Network (UCAN), Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)		Noted
d. Intervenor's claim of non-duplication: In responding to the Decision and engaging with issues raised in the proceeding, different parties focused on different aspects. EDF made unique points about the issue of cost-shifting from non-core to core customers as a result of transmission pipeline derating; and the need for a more comprehensive review process in line with GO 177 requirements. Moreover, EDF made significant contributions in the GO 177 process, including the annual reports from the investor-owned utilities and workshops.		Noted

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

A. General Claim of Reasonableness (§ 1801 and § 1806):

	CPUC Discussion
a. Intervenor's claim of cost reasonableness: EDF requests a total intervenor compensation claim of $ 64,408.30. This is reasonable for the scale of the proceeding, number of issues presented, and also given the fact that EDF addressed unique environmental issues in the proceeding.	Noted
b. Reasonableness of hours claimed: Attorney Time: EDF devoted a total of approximately 70.50 hours of attorney time for work performed by EDF's attorney, Elizabeth Kelly. This is reasonable for	Noted. However, see Part III D. CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments.

the scale of the proceeding and wide range of issues presented in the proceeding. Expert Time: EDF utilized approximately 7 hours of the expert time of Michael Colvin, EDF's Director of Regulatory and Legislative Affairs, California Energy Program. EDF utilized approximately 29.9 hours of the expert time of Joon Hun Seong, EDF's Senior Decarbonization Analyst. This is reasonable in light of the issues presented, particularly the issues uniquely raised.	
c. Allocation of hours by issue: **Issue** / **Allocation** Scoping of Track 2 Questions (b) – (k) / 30% Staff Gas Infrastructure Decommissioning Proposal / 20% GO 177 Workshop and Reports / 25% Transmission and Storage Decision / 25%	Noted, allocation of hours totals 100%.

B. Specific Claim: *

CLAIMED						**CPUC AWARD**		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	**Year**	**Hours**	**Rate $**	**Basis for Rate***	**Total $**	**Hours**	**Rate $**	**Total $**
Elizabeth Kelly	2022	29.60	625	Intervenor Compensation Rate for Attorney V	18,500	29.60	$570.00 [1], [8]	$16,872.00
Elizabeth Kelly	2023	40.90	710	Intervenor Compensation Rate for Attorney V	29,039	11.00 [4], [6], [7]	$625.00 [1], [8]	$6,875.00
Michael Colvin	2023	7.00	702	Intervenor Compensation Rate for Public Policy Analyst V	4,914	4.00 [5], [7]	$545.00 [2]	$2,180.00
Joon Hun Seong	2023	29.90	357	Intervenor Compensation Rate for Public Policy Analyst III	10,674.30	17.40 [6], [7]	$245.00 [3]	$4,263.00
					Subtotal: $63,127.30			***Subtotal: $30,190.00***

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	**Year**	**Hours**	**Rate $**	**Basis for Rate***	**Total $**	**Hours**	**Rate $**	**Total $**
Joon Hun Seong	2024	7	183	Intervenor Compensation Rate for Public Policy Analyst III; escalated by 5% (divided by two)	1,281	7.00	$137.50 [3]	$962.50
				Subtotal: $1,281				***Subtotal: $962.50***
				TOTAL REQUEST: $64,408.30				***TOTAL AWARD: $31,152.50***

*We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit the records and books of the intervenors to the extent necessary to verify the basis for the award (§1804(d)). Intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Intervenor's records should identify specific issues for which it seeks compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants and any other costs for which compensation was claimed. The records pertaining to an award of compensation shall be retained for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award.

**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time are typically compensated at ½ of preparer's normal hourly rate

ATTORNEY INFORMATION			
Attorney	**Date Admitted to CA BAR[3]**	**Member Number**	**Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation**
Elizabeth Kelly	12/28/2009 (CA) 3/5/2007 (NY)	268401 (CA) 4488938 (NY)	No

C. Attachments Documenting Specific Claim and Comments on Part III: ***(intervenor completes; attachments not attached to final decision)***

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
Attachment 1	Certificate of Service
Attachment 2	Resume of Elizabeth Kelly
Attachment 3	Resume of Michael Colvin
Attachment 4	Resume of Joon Hun Seong
Attachment 5	Timesheets

[3] This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California's website at http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch.

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
Comment 1	Rate for Elizabeth Kelly, Attorney Ms. Kelly's legal energy experience (15+ years) and expert energy economics and rate design experience prior to becoming an attorney are set forth on her resume, Attachment 2. Above the midpoint of the range is appropriate for Ms. Kelly due to her unique and extensive energy and regulatory experience, including: • Her economics degree which allows for a greater degree of understanding of financial and technical matters before the Commission; • Her experience in energy economic and rate design consulting which contributes to her substantive knowledge in energy; • The extent and depth of her experience in energy and project finance transactions; • Her experience in launching MCE, California's first Community Choice Aggregator, which required extensive legal and regulatory advocacy, in many cases without specific precedent before the California Public Utilities Commission; • Her experience serving clients specifically before the California Public Utilities Commission; and • Her service within energy and legal groups that have advanced her knowledge and experience, including: o Founder of the San Francisco Women General Counsel Circle o 2018 National Association of Women Lawyers General Counsel Institute, Member of Planning Committee and Workshops Subcommittee o 2017 National Association of Women Lawyers General Counsel Institute, Member of Planning Committee, Workshops Subcommittee, and Logistics Subcommittee. o 2016 CAISO Energy Imbalance Market Governing Body Nominating Committee, Public Interest and Consumer Advocate Committee Member

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
	○ 2015 CAISO Board of Governors Nominee Review Committee, End User and Retail Provider Committee Member
Comment 2	Rate for Michael Colvin, Expert Michael Colvin spent over 10 years at the California Public Utilities Commission and another 5 at Environmental Defense Fund. He holds a Master of Public Policy degree from UC Berkeley. Given his experience (15+ years of professional experience and a Master's degree), he is classified as public policy analyst V.
Comment 3	Rate for Joon Hun Seong, Expert • Joon Hun Seong has received a Master of Public Policy degree from UC Berkeley and has two years of previous policy analysis experience working for American Solar Partners, a solar developer based in Mt. Vernon, New York. He has worked as an analyst at Environmental Defense Fund focusing on gas utility regulatory issues for a little less than two years. Given his academic qualifications and professional experience, he is classified as public policy analyst III.

D. CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments

Item	Reason
[1] Kelly's 2022 and 2023 Hourly Rates	EDF verified Kelly's consultant status in the resume submitted with this claim. The Commission requested supplemental documentation be submitted by EDF to confirm the agreement and rates charged by Kelly. EDF has confirmed that Kelly is a member of EMK law serving EDF on a contingency basis where Kelly has agreed to defer its consulting fee contingent upon receipt of this Intervenor Compensation award. Given this contingency, we utilize the reasonable rates established by Resolution ALJ-393 based on Kelly's experience. Given the 2022 Attorney V rate range is $506.38 to $719.10, we find the 2022 hourly rate of $570.00 to be reasonable and we apply it here. Given the 2023 Attorney V rate range is $534.32 to $747.04, we find the 2023 hourly rate of $625.00 to be reasonable and we apply it here. The award determined herein for the consultant's contribution in this proceeding shall be paid in full to the consultant, and no portion of this part of

Item	Reason
	the award shall be kept by the intervenor. Additionally, the rates approved here are specific to work in this proceeding and the contract terms between the consultant and intervenor, as they are established in accordance with the Commission's policy on consultant compensation, and the understanding that the consultant has not billed or collected full compensation for the work performed until final award is given. We reiterate that it is the responsibility of the intervenor to be forthcoming about engaging consultants, to adhere to the Commission's policy on compensation for consultant fees, and to provide the appropriate documentation with the initial claim to ensure efficient processing, and thus avoid the need for the Commission to request supplemental documentation. In this instance, EDF did not provide all the documentation pertaining to the contract terms between EDF and Kelly in the initial claim and waited until the Commission requested supplemental documentation, which delays the processing of the claim.
[2] Colvin's 2023 Hourly Rate	D.25-08-047 adopted a 2023 hourly rate of $545.00 for Colvin
[3] Seong's 2023 Hourly Rate and 2024 Intervenor Compensation Preparation Rate	D.25-09-025 adopted a 2023 hourly rate of $245.00 for Seong and a 2024 hourly rate of $275.00 for Seong.
[4] Kelly's 2023 Disallowances	**Kelly's 2023 Disallowances (2.20 hours)** <u>Internal duplication (0.60):</u> The Commission compensates for the efficient effort that contributed to the proceeding's outcomes. In the past, the Commission has disallowed inefficient activities and applied reductions to hours that reflected excessive internal duplicative efforts, such as numerous internal communications, review of each other's documents, working on the same materials, engaging in the same tasks, and participating in the same events. We disallow the following hours as internal duplication of efforts as Colvin and Seong also attended. • 2/6/2023 – "Questions (d) and (e) - Call with PG&E re decommissioning" <u>Outside of Scope (1.40):</u> EDF requests compensation for attending an en banc held on February 7, 2023. The en banc was part of proceeding I.23-03-008 in which EDF

Item	Reason
	participated. The following hours requested for attending the en banc are out of scope for proceeding R.20-01-007 and therefore disallowed: • 2/7/2023 – "Attend Gas Price En Banc" • 2/7/2023 – "Review Gas Price En Banc Materials" Vagueness (0.20): EDF failed to provide an adequate description for the following time entry, leaving it unclear how this time contributed to the decision-making process. It is the responsibility of the intervenor to provide adequate descriptions that clearly support how their time led to a decision. See Rule 17.4 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure, and D.10-02-010, Part III.D. Therefore, the following hours are disallowed: • 2/13/2023 – "Draft email to Energy Division in advance of meeting"
[5] Colvin's 2023 Disallowances	**Colvin's 2023 Disallowances (2.00 hours)** Internal duplication (1.00): The Commission compensates for the efficient effort that contributed to the proceeding's outcomes. In the past, the Commission has disallowed inefficient activities and applied reductions to hours that reflected excessive internal duplicative efforts, such as numerous internal communications, review of each other's documents, working on the same materials, engaging in the same tasks, and participating in the same events. We disallow the following hours as internal duplication of efforts as Seong and Kelly also attended. Additionally, Colvin's work in this proceeding was focused on document review. We do not find a connection between Colvin's attendance on this call and his documented work output. • 2/6/2023 – "Call with PG&E on decommissioning" Outside of Scope (1.00): EDF requests compensation for attending an en banc held on February 7, 2023. The en banc was part of proceeding I.23-03-008 in which EDF participated. The following hours requested for attending the en banc are out of scope for proceeding R.20-01-007 and therefore disallowed: • 2/7/2023 – "Attend en banc"
[6] Disallowances Related to Track 2.1.d, 2.1.e, and 2.1.k and Similar Issues	**EDF's 2023 Disallowances (14.30 hours total; Kelly - 12.80 hours; Seong - 1.50 hours)** According to the R2001007 January 5, 2022, scoping memo, the Track 2a Issues 2.1.d, 2.1.e, and 2.1.k considered issues related to the decommissioning of gas distribution lines.

Item	Reason
Denied Without Prejudice	The Commission's consideration of these and similar issues has not yet been resolved. On February 22, 2024, the assigned Commissioner issued a ruling scheduling a Phase 3 Prehearing Conference and noting that consideration of distribution system issues would happen at a later date. Therefore, EDF's claim for hours related to decommissioning the gas distribution system is denied without prejudice. These hours may be reconsidered in Rulemaking 24-09-012 if the hours contribute to the Rulemaking's resolution of the issue. The following hours are denied without prejudice: <u>Comments of Environmental Defense Fund on Staff Gas Infrastructure Decommissioning Proposal (14.30 hours) – Filed 2/24/23:</u> The following hours associated with the drafting and completion of the Comments on the Staff Proposal have been disallowed: • Kelly (2023): 12.80 • Seong (2023): 1.50
[7] Disallowances Related to GO 177 Issues Denied Without Prejudice	**EDF's 2023 Disallowances (26.90 hours total; Kelly – 14.90 hours; Colvin – 1.00 hours; Seong 11.00 hours)** In D.22-12-021, the Commission adopted General Order 177 and established a process for interested parties to comment on gas utilities' report of planned gas investments. In D.24-09-034, the Commission partially granted a Petition for Modification to Decision 22-12-021. In considering the Petition for Modification, the Commission relied on the record from parties commenting on the GO 177 gas utilities' reports. However, this claim only seeks compensation for work related to D.23-12-003. In D.23-12-003, the Commission resolved issues regarding transmission pipelines and natural gas storage facilities, and did not consider the GO 177 record. Therefore, EDF's claim for hours related to work on GO 177 issues are denied without prejudice. EDF's hours for this work may be considered in a future claim if they are determined to have contributed to a decision. The following hours are denied without prejudice: <u>Motion of Environmental Defense Fund Requesting Technical Workshop – Filed 4/11/23 (15.80 hours):</u> The following hours associated with the drafting and completion of the Motion have been disallowed: • Kelly 2023: 14.80 hours • Colvin 2023: 1.00

Item	Reason
	Comments of Environmental Defense Fund On GO 177 Annual Report Workshop – Filed 10/31/23 (11.10 hours): The following hours associated with the drafting and completion of the Comments have been disallowed: • Kelly 2023: 0.10 • Seong 2023: 11.00 hours
[8] Intervenor Responsibility for Transparency and Accuracy in Compensation Requests	The Commission takes this opportunity to remind all intervenors that they bear the burden of providing accurate, complete, and honest information in all compensation requests. The Commission relies on intervenors' good faith representations, particularly regarding consultant agreements and payments, as it does not have the resources to review every contract or non-standard arrangement in detail. Intervenor compensation is funded by ratepayers, and the Commission takes seriously any effort to mislead or obscure the financial basis for a claim. Although no violation of Rule 1.1 has been found in this instance, we remind intervenors that under Rule 1.1, intent to deceive is not required for a violation, misstatements may still be actionable. Dishonest or misleading claims not only risk denial of compensation but may also subject the intervenor to penalties. The Commission has clear authority to audit intervenors' books and records to verify the basis for any award. Intervenors must therefore ensure full transparency regarding actual time spent on issues, consultant fees, payment arrangements, and the actual disbursement of funds. Failure to meet this obligation undermines the integrity of the compensation process and may lead to denial of claims or further enforcement action.

PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS
Within 30 days after service of this Claim, Commission Staff or any other party may file a response to the Claim (*see* § 1804(c))

A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the Claim?	No

B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (*see* Rule 14.6(c)(6))?	No

If not:

Party	Comment	CPUC Discussion

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Environmental Defense Fund has made a substantial contribution to D.23-12-003.
2. The requested hourly rates for Environmental Defense Fund's representatives, as adjusted herein, are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.
3. The claimed costs and expenses, as adjusted herein, are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
4. The total of reasonable compensation is $31,152.50.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

1. The Claim, with any adjustment set forth above, satisfies all requirements of Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812.

ORDER

1. Environmental Defense Fund is awarded $31,152.50.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Gas Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southwest Gas shall pay Environmental Defense Fund their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional gas revenues for the 2023 calendar year, to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated. If such data is unavailable, the most recent gas revenue data shall be used. Payment of the award shall include compound interest at the rate earned on prime, three-month non-financial commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning May 5, 2024, the 75th day after the filing of Environmental Defense Fund's request, and continuing until full payment is made.
3. The comment period for today's decision is not waived.

This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX

Compensation Decision Summary Information

Compensation Decision:		**Modifies Decision?**	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D2312003		
Proceeding(s):	R2001007		
Author:	ALJ Van Dyken and ALJ Purchia		
Payer(s):	Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Gas Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southwest Gas		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Environmental Defense Fund	February 20, 2024	$64,408.30	$31,152.50	N/A	*See* Part III.D CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments.

Hourly Fee Information

First Name	Last Name	Labor Role	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Elizabeth	Kelly	Attorney[4]	$625	2022	$570.00
Elizabeth	Kelly	Attorney[4]	$710	2023	$625.00
Michael	Colvin	Expert[5]	$702	2023	$545.00
Joon Hun	Seong	Expert[6]	$357	2023	$245.00
Joon Hun[7]	Seong[7]	Expert[7/8]	$366[7]	2024[7]	$275.00

(END OF APPENDIX)

[4] Kelly serves as a consultant to EDF.

[5] Colvin is classified as a Public Policy Analyst V. See Part III.D.[2].

[6] Seong is classified as a Public Policy Analyst II.

[7] Information added by the Commission to include Seong's 2024 hourly rate.

[8] Seong is classified as a Public Policy Analyst III.